



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/685,661	10/14/2003	Larry Fruge	LGPL.	5638
5251 7:	590 04/12/2004		EXAMINER	
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON LLP 2555 GRAND BLVD			GROSZ, ALEXANDER	
KANSAS CITY,, MO 64108			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3673	

DATE MAILED: 04/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

iker.		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		10/685,661	FRUGE, LARRY	\sim
Office Action Summary		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Alexander Grosz	3673	
The MAILING DATE of th Period for Reply	is communication app	ears on the cover sheet wi	ith the correspondence addr (C	ess
A SHORTENED STATUTORY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS - Extensions of time may be available unde after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing de - If the period for reply specified above, tl - Failure to reply within the set or extended Any reply received by the Office later than earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	COMMUNICATION. r the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 ate of this communication. ss than thirty (30) days, a reply me maximum statutory period wi period for reply will, by statute, three months after the mailing	6(a). In no event, however, may a rewithin the statutory minimum of thirtill apply and will expire SIX (6) MON cause the application to become AB	ry (30) days will be considered timely. ITHS from the mailing date of this comr NANDONED (35 U.S.C. & 133)	munication.
Status				
1) Responsive to communic	ation(s) filed on 1 o/	14/03		
2a) This action is FINAL .		action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in	n condition for allowan	ce except for formal matte	ers, prosecution as to the m	nerits is
closed in accordance with	the practice under <i>Ex</i>	x <i>parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims				
4) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are per	nding in the application	1.		
4a) Of the above claim(s)				
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>7-13</u> is/are allo				
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>/~6</u> is/are reje	ected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are obj	ected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subje	ct to restriction and/or	election requirement.		
Application Papers		•		
9)☐ The specification is object	ed to by the Examiner	•		
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on	is/are: a)□ acce	pted or b) abjected to I	by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request th	at any objection to the d	rawing(s) be held in abeyan	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
			s) is objected to. See 37 CFR	, ,
11) The oath or declaration is	objected to by the Exa	aminer. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-	-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ 1. ☐ Certified copies of t		•	119(a)-(d) or (f).	
2. ☐ Certified copies of t	he priority documents	have been received in A	pplication No	
			received in this National Sta	age
	International Bureau	` ` ''		
* See the attached detailed C	Office action for a list o	f the certified copies not i	received.	
Attachment(s)				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview S	ummary (PTO-413)	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawi	ng Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s))/Mail Date	
 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (Faper No(s)/Mail Date 	PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	5)	formal Patent Application (PTO-15 	52)

Application/Control Number: 10/685,661

Art Unit: 3673

Applicant is required to amend the "Abstract" to describe the border cover.

Applicant is required to submit a <u>PTO 1449</u>, listing the prior art cited in the parent application.

On page 1, line 5, "6,665,893" must be inserted.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-6 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-7 of U.S. Patent No. 6,665,893.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the pending claims are merely broader versions of the patented claims, as the pending claims omit the limitations to the valve being located adjacent the head end of the second mattress.

Claims 7-13 are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Alex Grosz at telephone number (703) 308-2498.

Application/Control Number: 10/685,661

Art Unit: 3673

Grosz/vs April 7, 2004 ALEXANDER GROSZ PRIMARY EXAMINER